

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

BRAC 05 REALIGNMENT and ARMY MODULAR FORCE TRANSFORMATION ACTIONS AT FORT BRAGG, NORTH CAROLINA

On May 13, 2005, the Secretary of Defense recommended that certain realignment actions occur at Fort Bragg, North Carolina (NC) and Pope Air Force Base (AFB), NC. After review of the Secretary of Defense's recommendations, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission ("BRAC Commission") submitted its final recommendations to the President on September 8, 2005. These recommendations were approved by the President on September 15, 2005, and forwarded to Congress. Congress did not alter any of the BRAC Commission's recommendations, and on November 9, 2005, the recommendations became law. The BRAC Commission recommendations must now be implemented as provided for in the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-510), as amended.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District, has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) which identifies, documents, and evaluates environmental effects of the BRAC Commission's recommended realignment of Fort Bragg, NC as well as other Army Transformation actions proposed at the installation. The EA has been developed in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and implementing regulations issued by the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)¹. The 2006 Base Realignment Closure Manual for Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act was used for guidance in preparing the EA. The purpose of the EA is to inform decision makers and the public of the likely environmental consequences of the proposed action and alternatives.

1.0 PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action involves implementation of the Commission's recommendations as mandated by the BRAC legislation, Public Law 101-510 and 107-107; implementation of BRAC discretionary moves; and implementation of other Army Modular Force (AMF) and stationing actions proposed to occur at Fort Bragg that were sufficiently well defined for analysis at this time. It should be noted that the Commission made recommendations for realignment activities that involve Air Force personnel and equipment at Pope AFB, which are beyond Army decision making authority, and are not included in the EA as a result.

Implementation of these actions entails constructing numerous buildings and facilities necessary to accommodate the incoming mission responsibilities and associated personnel and equipment that would be coming to Fort Bragg as a result. The EA documents our estimate that between 2005 and 2011 the combined Fort Bragg and Pope Army Airfield (formerly Pope AFB) would gain approximately 2500 tactical vehicles and experience a cumulative increase of approximately 2300 military, 1500 civilian, and 350 contractor personnel. PL 101-510, as amended, mandates that implementation of all BRAC-directed recommendations must begin no later than 15 September 2007 and conclude no later than 15 September 2011. As a result, BRAC actions identified in the EA must be implemented during that period, while other actions not included in the BRAC legislation, including AMF and other non-BRAC stationing actions, can be implemented after that deadline expires.

BRAC Directed Actions: Relocate Headquarters (HQ) US Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) and the HQ US Army Reserve Command (USARC) from Fort McPherson, GA to Pope Air Force Base, NC; Realign Fort Bragg, NC, by relocating the 7th Special Forces Group (SFG) to Eglin AFB, FL, and by activating the 4th Brigade Combat Team (BCT), 82d Airborne Division and relocating European-based forces to Fort Bragg; Transfer real property accountability of Pope AFB to the Army; Relocate all mobilization processing functions from Fort Eustis, VA, Fort Jackson, SC, and Fort Lee, VA to create a Joint Pre-Deployment/Mobilization Site at Bragg/Pope.

BRAC Discretionary Actions: Relocate Atlanta Field Office (US Army Audit Agency) from Fort McPherson, GA to Bragg/Pope, NC; Relocate 10th Public Affairs Detachment from Fort Gillem, GA to Bragg/Pope, NC; Relocate 44th Military History Detachment from Fort McPherson, GA to Bragg/Pope, NC; Relocate Headquarters and

¹ Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act, 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500-1508, and Environmental Analysis of Army Actions, 32 CFR Part 651.

Headquarters Company, 416th Engineer Command from Fort McPherson, GA to Bragg/Pope, NC; Relocate HQ USA FORSCOM (Liaison Officer at Red River Depot) from Red River Depot to Bragg/Pope, NC; Relocate US Army Reserve Component Support Team from Fort McPherson, GA to Bragg/Pope, NC; Relocate National Inventory Control Point Logistics Assistance Representative McPherson from Fort McPherson, GA to Bragg/Pope, NC; Relocate Field Sustainment Command, Army Material Command, continental US from Fort McPherson, GA to Bragg/Pope, NC; Relocate Ammunition Liaison Officer for US Army Reserve Command from Ft McPherson to Ft Bragg; Relocate Ammunition Liaison Officer for US Army Forces Command from Ft McPherson to Ft Bragg; Relocate Logistics Civil Augmentation Program (LOGCAP) program manager from Fort McPherson, GA to Bragg/Pope, NC.

Global Defense Posture Realignment (GDPR) Actions: Relocate European-based forces to Fort Bragg, NC: Renovate existing facilities to accommodate relocation of 20 dog handlers.

Relocate/Activate the following units to Fort Bragg, NC: 108 Air Defense Artillery (ADA) Brigade HHB; 1-7 ADA Battalion; 270 Signal Company; 11 Quartermaster Company; 586 Signal Company; 32d MP Detachment, Criminal Investigation Division; 14th Human Resource Support Center; 125th AG DET (Postal); 722d Explosive Ordnance Company.

AMF and Other Projects in Support of Stationing Actions: These actions included here are necessary to continue the transformation to an AMF, and involve reorganization of some units and additional facilities. Nevertheless, Army transformation has been underway at Fort Bragg and numerous projects have been analyzed and subsequently implemented to accomplish the objective of transformation. The AMF projects included here constitute the currently identified projects necessary to support transformation initiatives at Fort Bragg.

Transformation of Three Brigades to Three Modular Force BCTs: 1st, 2nd, and 3rd BCT complexes (PN 64340, 64447, and 64342)

Special Operations Forces (SOF)/Special Operations Command (SOC): Special Operations Command (USASOC) Physical Fitness Facility (PN 33802); USASOC HQ Complex/Motor Pool (PN 61891); SOF Indoor Baffle Range (PN 63437); SOF Operational Northwest Addition (PN 64479); SOF Operational Northeast Addition (PN 64483); Special Forces Qualification Barracks (PN 65558); Security Operations Training Facility (SOTF) Forward Aircraft Refueling Point (SF0000-5P)

Training Facilities: Battle Command Training Center (BCTC) (PN 20347)

Other Transformation Projects: Modular Headquarters/82nd Airborne Division Headquarters (PN 44968); Child Care Center (PN 54912); Company Operations Facilities (COF), Fires Brigade (PN 65204)

Summary of Actions: Table 1.1 Proposed Construction Projects

Project No.	Facility	Square Feet*	Construction Start Date
20347	Battle Command Training Center (BCTC)	145,000	March 2009
33802	USASOC Physical Fitness Facility	60,000	April 2013
41176	Blood Donor Center	11,500	March 2009
44968	82nd Division Modular Headquarters	105,000	March 2007
54912	Child Development Center	23,000	April 2012
57836	Central Load-out Area Control Center	16,000	March 2007
58708	Robinson Clinic Addition	35,000	March 2008
60828	Operational Readiness Training Complex	213,000	Not given**
61035	Chapel, 82nd Airborne Division	33,000	March 2014
61891	USASOC Headquarters Complex/Motor Pool	177,000	March 2008
63437	Indoor Baffle Range	23,000	March 2008
64244	Consolidated Troop Clinic	31,000	March 2010
64305	FORSCOM/USARC HQ (64305a)	702,000	March 2009
	DOIM Cable Yard (64305b)	-	
	DMWR Warehouse (64305e)	(15,000)	
	Knox Street Extension (FORSCOM) (64305f)	(3,000 LF)	
	FORSCOM/DOIM Mail Screening Facility (64305c)	(5,400)	
	FORSCOM/USARC/DOIM Server Farm Facility (64305d)	(25,000)	

Project No.	Facility	Square Feet*	Construction Start Date
64333	FORSCOM Band Facility	19,800	***
64326	Joint Pre Deployment Mobilization Site Ph I	1,626,000	March 2008
64329	Vehicle Maintenance Facility 4th BCT	215,000	March 2007
64340	1st BCT Complex	212,000	March 2010
64342	3rd BCT Complex	46,000	March 2012
64446	4th BCT Roundout	197,000	March 2007
64447	2nd BCT Complex	125,000	April 2010
64479	SOF Operational Northwest Addition	113,000	March 2007
64483	SOF Operational Northeast Addition	114,000	March 2007
64968	Contingency Warehouse	248,500	***
64969	Surface Distribution Center	60,000	***
64974	Ball Fields	(243,000SF surface area)	March 2013
65204	Fires Brigade COFs	51,000	March 2011
65558	Special Forces Qualification Barracks	279,000	March 2008
66655	Gen Officer Quarters	36,000	March 2010
SF00007-5P	SOTF Forward Aircraft Refueling Point FARP	(240,000SF surface area)	
	TOTAL	4,932,300*	

Source: Fort Bragg Directorate of Public Works, Form DD 1391.

*Interior space, area figures are approximate and still incomplete, so this number represents a low estimate. ** Most recent 1391 lacked sufficient data. *** Not in current FYDP.

2.0 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

CEQ regulations require inclusion of the no action alternative. The no action alternative serves as a baseline against which the impacts of the proposed action and alternatives can be evaluated. Under the no action alternative, Fort Bragg would not implement the proposed action. Organizations presently assigned to Fort Bragg would continue to train at and operate from the post. No units would relocate from overseas locations. No new units would be established. Fort Bragg would use its current inventory of facilities, though routine replacement or renovation actions could occur, through normal military maintenance and construction procedures, as circumstances independently warrant. The no action alternative is evaluated in detail in this EA to provide the baseline prescribed by CEQ regulations; nevertheless, since PL 101-510, as amended, mandates implementation of these recommendations, the no action alternative analyzed in the EA cannot be selected and subsequently implemented.

The Army considered and analyzed one other alternative, the realignment, or “preferred,” alternative. Under the preferred alternative, all 34 projects would be constructed as described in the proposed action, adding approximately 4,900,000 square feet of built space. Siting of these projects would be consistent with Fort Bragg Real Property Master Plan. Proposed locations for new construction fall within six general areas within Fort Bragg, with two additional locations at Pope AFB and Simmons Army Airfield for alternatives to the preferred site.

Other alternatives were considered, but not analyzed. These included (1) use of existing facilities at Fort Bragg; (2) use of other DoD installations for non-BRAC actions; and (3) new construction in locations other than those identified in the preferred alternative. With the exception of six projects for which new construction alternatives at another location were analyzed, these other alternatives were considered not feasible to implement the proposed action and were therefore dismissed from further analysis.

3.0 FACTORS CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING THAT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT IS NOT REQUIRED

The Environmental Assessment (EA), which is incorporated by reference into this Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI), examined potential effects of the proposed action and no action alternative on 12 resource areas and areas of environmental and socioeconomic concern: land use, aesthetic and visual resources, air quality, noise, geology and soils, water resources, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomic (including environmental justice and protection of children), transportation, utilities, and hazardous and toxic substances. For each of these areas, the EA defines criteria for determining when impacts can be considered to be “significant.” Based on these criteria included in the EA, implementation of the proposed actions would not have any significant adverse effects or impacts on any of the environmental or related resource areas at Fort Bragg or to areas surrounding the post. One of two

classifications of impacts would be experienced as shown in the EA analysis: (1) no effect, and (2) no significant effects.

The preferred alternative would not have any significant adverse effects on any of the environmental or related resource areas at Fort Bragg or to areas surrounding the post. The proposed action would have no effect on the regional geographic setting and location, surrounding land uses, prime farmland, floodplains, the coastal zone, American Indian resources, and issues relating to the protection of children.

The proposed action would have no significant effects on any resource areas of the environment or any socioeconomic concerns. The following is a brief synopsis of resource areas that would be affected by the proposed action and an explanation as to why those effects would not be significant:

Fort Bragg has ensured biological resources would not be significantly affected by informally consulting with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in the form of two biological assessments and one letter. The USFWS has concurred on all projects. Furthermore Fort Bragg would continue to follow the Installation Natural Resources Management Plan and use best management practices. Fort Bragg would ensure transportation would not be significantly affected by continuing to follow established procedures to reduce delays at access control points, by conducting a traffic impact study and developing a thoroughfare plan. The effects of training associated with increased personnel would not be significant because the type of training at Fort Bragg would remain generally the same (non-tracked vehicles only, minimal digging activities and primarily transient foot traffic). Furthermore, all provisions of the Installation Range Regulations and USFWS-issued Biological Opinions would continue to be followed. Fort Bragg would consult with the State Historic Preservation Office during the final design of projects to ensure no cultural resources are significantly affected. Although new emission sources would be part of some of the proposed construction, significant impacts to air quality would not occur at Fort Bragg or to the surrounding area as a result. New emission sources would be evaluated for CAA regulatory permitting thresholds as final designs become available and Fort Bragg would take necessary measures to stay below these thresholds (i.e. – measures to reduce fuel and raw material output or add-on controls). Effects associated with noise would not be significant as a result of the proposed action. Noise resulting from construction activities would be of the same type currently experienced in and around Fort Bragg, and would be short term. Although, it may become necessary to extend construction hours beyond daylight weekday hours in order to meet the BRAC-mandated timetable, Fort Bragg would be mindful of its neighbors and limit extended hours to the extent possible. Noise effects resulting from an increase in training at Fort Bragg would not be significant. As stated previously, the types of training and vehicles being used at Fort Bragg would generally remain the same (light infantry units with non-tracked vehicles). Furthermore, the proposed 2300 person increase in the number military personnel is relatively minor when compared to the currently assigned 40,000+ military personnel.

The expected impacts of the proposed alternatives to the proposed action would be the same as those anticipated for the proposed action, with the following exceptions: there would be no effect on wetland habitat and archaeological resources.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Based on the EA, it has been determined that implementation of the proposed action would have no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative adverse effects on the quality of the natural or human environment. Since no significant impacts are anticipated, mitigation is not needed, and implementing the proposed action would not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. As a result, preparation of a FNSI is appropriate. Because no significant environmental impacts would result from implementation of the proposed action, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required and will not be prepared.

5.0 PUBLIC COMMENT

Interested parties are invited to review and comment on the EA and FNSI from 4 December 2006 to 3 January 2007. Comments and requests for copies of the EA should be addressed to Mr. David Heins, Chief, Environmental Sustainment Division, Department of Public Works (IMSE-BRG-PWE); Fort Bragg Garrison Command (ABN); Installation Management Agency; Fort Bragg, NC 28310; or by telephone at (910) 396-8207.

The EA is available for review at the following libraries:

Cumberland County Public Library & Information Center
Local & State History
300 Maiden Lane
Fayetteville, NC 28301-5000

John L. Throckmorton Library & Command Reference Center
ATTN: AFZA-CAS-EL
Bldg. 1-3346, Randolph St.
Fort Bragg, NC 28310-5000

Harnett County Public Library
601 North Main Street
PO Box 1149
Lillington, NC 27546

Hoke County Public Library
334 N. Main Street
Raeford, NC 28376

Lee County Library System
107 Hawkins Ave
Sanford, NC 27330

Moore County Public Library
101 Saunders St
PO Box 400
Carthage, NC 28327

Southern Pines Public Library
170 W. Connecticut Ave.
Southern Pines, NC 28387

Spring Lake Branch Library
101 Laketree Blvd
Spring Lake, NC 28390-3189

Date: _____

David G. Fox
COL, Special Forces, Garrison Commander
Fort Bragg, North Carolina